

REMARKS

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 2, 5, and 8 are cancelled herein without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter set forth therein. Claim 10 was previously cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter set forth therein. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9 and 11-13 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, and 11-13 are amended. Claims 1, 4, 7, and 11-13 are independent. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections in view of the remarks set forth herein.

Reasons for Entry of Amendment

By way of this Reply, the Applicants are submitting a Verified English Translation of Priority Document (JP 2000-117667), thereby overcoming the rejection of claims 1-9 and 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on the combination of Yamada et al. (U.S. 2005/0125381), Maruyama et al. (U.S. 2004/0021907), and Truc et al. (U.S. 2004/00221907).

In addition, each of claims 1, 4, 7, and 11-13 has been amended merely to include previously examined subject matter set forth in dependent claims 2, 5, and 8. Claims 2, 5, and 8 have now been cancelled.

It is respectfully requested that this Reply be entered into the Official File in view of the fact that the claims as amended automatically place the application in condition for allowance. Each of the claims now pending in this application only contains subject matter that has previously been considered by the Examiner. Therefore, no new issues have been

raised by this Amendment that would warrant or require an additional search of the art by the Examiner.

In the alternative, if the Examiner does not agree that this application is in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that this Reply be entered for the purpose of appeal. This Reply reduces the issues on appeal by canceling claims 2, 5, and 8, thereby reducing the number of pending claims. This Reply was not presented at an earlier date in view of the fact that the Examiner has just now presented new grounds for rejection in this Final Office Action.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-9 and 11-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as unpatentable over Yamada et al. (U.S. 2005/0125381) in view of Maruyama et al. (U.S. 2004/0021907) and Truc et al. (U.S. 2004/00221907).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicants are submitting a Verified English Translation of Priority Document (JP 2000-117667), thereby overcoming the rejection of claims 1-9 and 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on the combination of Yamada et al. (U.S. 2005/0125381), Maruyama et al. (U.S. 2004/0021907), and Truc et al. (U.S. 2004/00221907).

Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 4, 7, and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) based on Maruyama et al. (U.S. 2004/0021907) and Truc et al. (U.S. 2004/00221907).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance the prosecution of the present application, each of independent claims 1 and 11 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 2, each of independent claims 4 and 12 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 5, and each of independent claims 7 and 13 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 8,

The references cited by the Examiner differ from the present invention as set forth in each of claims 1, 4, 7, and 11-13, at least for the following reasons:

Regarding Maruyama et al.

The Examiner refers to page 17, paragraph [0310] of Maruyama et al. As best understood by the Applicants, however, Maruyama et al. merely disclose "recording information about the recording contents of the optical disc 10 is printed on the surface of the optical disc 10". As can be seen in paragraph [0310] and in FIG. 22, "information about the recording contents of the optical disc 10" merely "corresponds to representative picture data ..." and is not the same as the actual thumbnail images. Nowhere in Maruyama et al. is there any disclosure of printing (or attaching) thumbnail images to the surface of the storage medium. In addition, Maruyama et al. fail to provide any disclosure of representative images being selected based on predetermined data attached to said plural sets of image data, as

required by independent claims 1, 4, 7, and 11-13.

Regarding Truc et al.

The Examiner refers to FIGS. 1-3 of Truc et al. As best understood by the Applicants, Truc et al. merely disclose printing thumbnail images of all of the photographs on the disc (See the Abstract, and FIGS. 1 and 3). Therefore, Truc et al. fail to provide any disclosure of representative images being selected based on predetermined data attached to said plural sets of image data, as required by independent claims 1, 4, 7, and 11-13.

Accordingly, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn.

Independent claims 1, 4, 7, and 11-13 are in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims

The Examiner will note that dependent claims 2, 5, and 8 have been cancelled, and non-narrowing amendments have been made to each of dependent claims 3, 6, and 9.

All dependent claims are in condition for allowance due to their dependence on allowable independent claims, or due to the additional novel features set forth therein.

All pending claims are now in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone Carl T. Thomsen, Registration No 50,786, at (703) 208-4030 (direct line).

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Dated: **MAR 26 2007**

Respectfully submitted,
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 

Marc S. Weiner
Reg. No. 32,181
P. O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

MSW/CTT/tg 